Brown University Faculty Bulletin

Volume X/Number 2, Current Issue: May 2010

FACULTY BULLETIN
TABLE OF CONTENTS

MAY 2010

PAGE

Editorial Introduction

Peter Wegner and Peter Richardson
Editors

Our Spring Issue of the *Faculty Bulletin* includes articles which reflect on the nature of the university, how it evolved, how it continues to evolve, how it builds to renew and better itself, and directions in which it may choose to go.

The issue of evolving carefully is very topical, as we are in the midst of considering refinements in how we go about deciding who will be given tenure. President Ruth Simmons discusses this in "On Building Brown", welcoming the on-going debate to continue with clear vision of raising our aspirations in considering how that is to be best accomplished in our own unique context. The high participation and collegiality already shown this May at the faculty meeting demonstrates our commitment to talk this through. Bill Simmons brings to us his reflections on recent writings about the nature and development of the university, especially in the context of a liberal education. His quote of Cronan, "Liberal education nurtures human freedom in the service of human community, which is to say that in the end it celebrates love," seems particularly apt for Brown, extending forwards from its description of purpose in its Charter. That its graduates should be "qualified for discharging the offices of life with usefulness and reputation", to implementation via the New Curriculum to nurture human freedom, we already took a definite step ahead.

Description of our own recent history, in terms of individual departments and programs, is extended further by Patrick Malone, writing about the Urban Studies Program, which has been an exemplary interdepartmental program, and more recently inter-institutional as well through its collaborations with the Rhode Island School of Design.

Three contributions are focused particularly on going forward. Matt Gutmann describes methods and approaches to extending international affairs, both in studies for our students and increased opportunities for international collaborations for faculty. David Cooper proposes we re-think of problems our world faces, in broad-brush terms, and how we add to the future usefulness of our graduates by giving fresh emphasis to the role of information, its origins, movement and interpretation in reaching possible solutions. Peter Richardson discusses the history of medicine as promoted by US-born Sir Henry Wellcome, who accumulated a vast collection of books and artefacts, many distinctly humanistic that became resources for the Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine, and our opportunities in our university culture to participate more visibly in this field.

Finally, Phil Davis reminds us that even after books and other items are published, there is an afterlife of written reviews, which will continue in various forms.

These are other modes of assessment of our successes, and may inform perceptions of how well we are progressing towards our ideals.

Cover Photo: Spring Weekend by Seekonk River 1962, Peter Richardson

On Building Brown

Ruth J. Simmons
President

I was recently approached by an alumnus who forcefully expressed the opinion that there was far too much emphasis at Brown today on buildings. Mentioning one particular example during his time as a student, he was especially scornful of hiring renowned architects. Many in the alumni community express the precisely opposite view: that Brown pays scant attention to preserving the architectural distinction of the campus and that we should be more attentive to hiring the best architects and campus designers to enhance the campus. I have now become accustomed to the fact that a great many students, staff members, faculty and alumni have a very particular take on the University's priorities and decisions. Though I am aware of how fraught this very fact makes governance of the University, I nevertheless recognize this broad-based concern and involvement as one of the defining strengths of Brown. Leading Brown requires a long-term perspective and the patience to listen to all views on the best course for a University of Brown's unique mission and distinction.

The current debate at Brown about the status of the tenure process has produced divided perspectives on an issue that is central to the identity and strength of the University in the coming times. Disagreements over tenure policy generally and about specific tenure cases have long been a prominent element of the landscape in all universities and colleges. Indeed, as long as tenure endures in higher education, versions of this debate will continue in its many familiar forms and the enduring questions will no doubt remain:

Is tenure an outdated concept?
What are the appropriate standards for tenure at the present time in a university's history?
In the context of tenure, how does one accommodate the on-going revitalization of the faculty?
And so on.

It is fair and perhaps even necessary for such questions to persist and for them to be taken up by all universities from time to time. Given the immense portion of a university's assets devoted to guaranteeing lifetime faculty tenure, good sense and good governance require this periodic assessment. Such reviews, if rigorous, may even help to reassure prominent skeptics of tenure and extend the life of this policy in the face of growing calls for its demise. Beyond helping to reassure skeptics of the rigor of the process, routine review of tenure should reassure all of us who support the concept of tenure that it is essential not merely because it is a cherished academic tradition but because, if exercised appropriately, its wise use produces stronger and stronger educational institutions over time. And those stronger and healthier institutions are the bulwark of societal advancement.

Universities, then, have an obligation to continue to demonstrate that tenure functions well and is useful to society. A credible tenure system must not only be internally clear, fair and valid but it should also reflect well upon the seriousness with which universities take their responsibilities to be exacting in improving the system and monitoring its effectiveness. Heated but civil debate is an appropriate sign that Brown faculty and administration take seriously their role in assuring the depth of that ongoing review.

For tenure is an inestimably elegant societal tool not only when it works well but also when it is seen by those outside the Academy to work well. The protection of scholars from dangerous religious, political, or ideological interference can, even today in the most democratic societies, be shown to have an important positive effect. In my mind, protecting scholars from such interference is tantamount to protecting society itself from veering off the rails of progress. Scholars who hold tenure are more emboldened to present challenges to the status quo, to overturn flawed or corrupt ideas and methods, and to push society forward with knowledge as the core enabler of decision making. Thus, the task of explicating and refining tenure, while a challenging task, is an essential contribution to societal advancement.

One element of that explication is revealing why tenure functions in vastly different ways across the Academy and why, in spite of that, it remains a valid approach. To different degrees, I have now been responsible for the tenure process at four different institutions: two highly ranked colleges (Spellman and Smith where I chaired the central tenure committees) and two highly ranked universities (Princeton and, now, Brown). At each institution, the process of advancing to tenure is the result of a unique history, mission, student mix, institutional health and, of course, level of aspirations.

Any tenure system and its apparatus will be the result of what a university is trying to accomplish as well as what fortunes it may have experienced in the past. In a university where student ability, interest and demands as well as institutional resources suggest the need for a faculty focusing almost exclusively on teaching, the progression toward tenure may be defined and organized one way. Since a heavy teaching, advising and service load typically results in less time for scholarship, a university at this end of the spectrum may require less scholarly output to attain tenure and tenure rates may be somewhat more generous in order to attract faculty. At the other extreme, where exceptional student ability requires a more challenging academic environment and resources afford greater support for research, an institution may require higher scholarly output and lower tenure rates may be typical.

The question of where Brown stands along this truly wide spectrum arose unexpectedly when the NEASC team visiting Brown for its decennial reaccreditation noted that the data they had seen suggested that Brown, given its stated aspirations, might have placed itself in the wrong place on this spectrum. Simply put, they indicated that, if we are to be a major research university as evidenced by our membership in the Ivy League and in the Association of American Universities, the ratio at which junior faculty are awarded tenure at Brown is an anomaly and therefore may be a cause for concern. Their observation led the Provost, at the request of the Corporation, to lead a study clarifying how Brown compares with its peers in regard to the award of tenure. Appointing a Committee on Tenure and Faculty Development Policies to consider this question and issue a report, the Provost also invited many groups from across the campus to offer comments about this topic.

The action of the Corporation was not unusual. Corporations or boards of trustees are generally endowed by charter with the sole authority to grant tenure. As part of that responsibility and, further, as fiduciaries, such oversight bodies are rightly accountable for whether tenure decisions are appropriate to the goals that the board has set. They must challenge the faculty and administration to make any needed adjustments in the standards and review process if they find or anticipate a growing gap between those goals and the apparent results of tenure recommendations.

The March, 2010 report of the Committee on Tenure and Faculty Development Policies reviewed "the way tenure is awarded and the ways it helps the faculty to succeed." (p. 1 of the *Report on Tenure and Faculty Development*) Team members were measured in their approach to their task, avoiding deliberately any temptation to suggest a specific place on the spectrum of university tenure profiles:

"…(T)he committee's response to… the NEASC report has *not* been to propose lowering the tenure rate to any specific figure, nor to impose an artificial limit on the proportion of faculty who are tenured. However, we have been mindful of the fact that Brown's review processes need to be rigorous, not only in order to guarantee academic excellence but also to guard against the dangers represented by an overly-tenured faculty, since too high a proportion of tenured faculty limits, over the long term, opportunities for faculty renewal and revitalization." (*Report*, p. 2)

This statement, with which surely any faculty member would agree in principle, is an excellent one, defining as it does the central element of any strong faculty program. Making the best and most appropriate use of its assets in the service of excellence in teaching, scholarship and service is the central task of a university in any era. In offering factual comparisons between tenure at Brown and tenure at peer institutions, the committee did a superb job of outlining the many considerations that confront the Brown community as we consider how tenure at Brown should evolve in the coming years.

The recommendations flowing from the Committee's deliberations have much to offer. Those concerning faculty development are excellent and should be implemented. Those concerning annual reviews would, I believe, provide helpful guidance for junior faculty who often find annual reviews to lack the clarity they need to advance successfully to tenure. The extension of the probationary period addresses a long established complaint about the tenure process across all universities where "up or out" may force a prematurely negative tenure decision in the face of an extraordinarily promising career. I think that many would agree that other recommendations offer similar improvements.

Some recommendations have been seen as more controversial with some faculty observing that the Committee went too far in suggesting changes in the tenure process and others observing that the changes do not go far enough. Much of the disagreement centers on the ideal balance between administration and faculty roles in assessing tenure candidates. Most tenure systems are created to enable a balance among different stakeholders in the process. The department, having observed at close hand the candidate's quality of mind, ongoing scholarship, commitment to teaching, and university service, determines whether the candidate can satisfy the needs and standards of the department. But the department only recommends tenure. The Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Appointments (TPAC) considers whether the case for tenure has been made not merely based on departmental standards but also on university standards as applied in a variety of cases across the university. The TPAC decision is also but a recommendation. The Provost must consider the TPAC recommendation in light of the broadest institutional considerations. His recommendation to the President, barring an appeal and finding by the President of procedural or discriminatory grounds for reversal, is forwarded to the Corporation for final action. The Corporation then makes a decision about the award of tenure to each candidate recommended. This total process assures the Corporation that, over time, decisions that obligate the University for such a long period of time are given the fullest analysis in consideration of the fact that a wrong decision is exceedingly difficult to correct.

Some feel that it is essential to have a faculty committee assess the fairness of a negative decision. At Brown, the unusual provision is also made for the Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity to examine whether University policy regarding discrimination has been breached when negative decisions are made by TPAC or the Provost. The candidate may also use the faculty grievance procedure to explore whether his or her case was fairly considered at all levels of review. The extent of redress available to a candidate who is denied tenure is remarkable and, again, a strong indication of Brown's historic commitment to a fair review.

Yet, taken as a whole, there is possibly no more cumbersome system of tenure review in the annals of higher education. In spite of the good intentions of the multiple levels of review, I have often found in hearing appeals that the tenure candidate finds in this network of committees and processes a maze of conflicting information, if not intentions. We need a proper balance between a tenure system that insists on the utmost rigor in granting lifetime tenure and a process that provides adequate time, resources, information and opportunity to the faculty member who must undergo such scrutiny. A sensible place to start to identify that balance is to consider where Brown should position itself in relation to its history and its future.

Alumni freely admit, and often with a sense of pride, that if they applied to Brown today, they would not be admitted. In saying that, they are conveying their approval that the University has become a place which demands more of its applicants today than it was able to do during their time at Brown. They celebrate the fact that, due in part to their achievements as alumni, the fortunes of the University have risen, making Brown one of the most appreciated universities in the world. It is not simply the record number of applicants and single digit admission rate that attest to this fact, it is also the evidence that the University is competing in so many different ways at the highest level of its peers. They are not embarrassed by that fact; they see it as evidence of the growing strength of the University.

Similarly, it was inevitable that, over time, as faculty members succeeded, the University's prominence would grow, and Brown's appeal to prospective faculty and students would continue on a positive trajectory. We should also expect that, barring a marked deterioration in the university's fortunes, Brown will continue to be faced with greater demands accompanied by even greater opportunities. Should the University reject such opportunities or work to develop a flatter trajectory? Few are likely to think this a suitable way to build on the success of Brown faculty and students.

The recommendations of the Tenure and Faculty Development Committee provide one step in trying to address the fact that Brown is in a position to demand more of itself over the coming years. The measures put forth by the Committee attempt to prepare the tenure system for the implicit demands of the success of the university. The evidence abounds that there can be many approaches to a rigorous tenure review. However, some of those approaches may be a poor fit for the history and culture of Brown. Although the Committee on Faculty Tenure and Development could have advanced more radical recommendations, it set forth instead rather modest proposals believed to mesh better with Brown's approach to tenure, which heavily favors the rights of the candidate.

As we continue to consider the Committee's observations and proposals, it is important to acknowledge that this could be a pivotal moment in the community's consideration of its future. Brown has been shaped by many decades of devoted teachers, scholars, administrators, students, alumni leaders, and Corporation members who, working together, forged a unique path in higher education. It should not be lost on us that any decisions we are privileged to make today are made possible by the quality of decisions made by those who came before us. Such decisions were shaped by necessity and opportunity. They were shaped by discord and accommodation. They were influenced by ideals, politics, and history. We look to those decisions today in awe of what our forebears were able to make of so many apparently disparate strands.

The record of our debate on tenure will enter the annals and be seen in the future as vital to what Brown will have become. So, let the debate about tenure at Brown continue. Let it be as robust as required of such an important matter. And, in the end, let us preserve among us and for those who admire and support Brown the sense that whatever we do, we do with utmost care, rigor, integrity, and civility.

Curriculore

William Simmons
Professor of Anthropology

A presence that is reminiscent of Max Weber's ghost of religious beliefs inhabits our institutions of higher learning (1). Often referred to as a *genius loci*, or spirit of the place, this presence to my knowledge does not have a proper name. Many, however, write about it, some in specifically Biblical language and others in more seemingly metaphorical terms, such as Page Smith's *Killing the Spirit: Higher Education in America,* and Harry R. Lewis's *Excellence Without a Soul: How a Great University Forgot Education*. I am particularly curious about this presence, how it manifests itself, and how scholars and others apprehend it. This article represents some of the sites I have visited in this pursuit.

Cathedral schools and cloister schools, very humble and very modest as they were, were the kind from which our whole system of education emerged. Elementary schools, universities, colleges; all these derived from there; and that is why it is here that we have had to make our starting-point. Moreover because it was from this primitive cell that the whole of our academic organization in all its complexity originated, this and this alone does and can explain certain essential features which education has exhibited in the course of its history, or which it has retained right down to our own times (Durkheim 1977 [1904-05]: 24).

Emile Durkheim, in his 1904-05 lectures on *The History of Education in France,* claimed that early Christianity, through its emphasis on conversion, departed dramatically from the educational practices of Classical antiquity. In the ancient world, he argued, the student learned from teachers who operated independently from one another and did not share a common goal. Whereas the educators in antiquity aimed to pass on certain aesthetic and utilitarian talents, Christian education aimed to shape the person at a deeper level. Christian teachers and students worked together in a single place and in an enveloping, communitarian way. "Even today," Durkheim observed, "we have no other conception of education" (Ibid.: 29).

Christianity…developed an awareness that underlying the particular condition of our intelligence and sensibility there is in each one of us a more profound condition which determines the others and gives them unity; and it is this more profound condition which we must get at if we are truly to do our job as educators and have an effect which will be durable. Christianity was aware that the forming of a man was not a question of decorating his mind with certain ideas, nor of getting him to contract certain specific habits; it is a question of creating within him a general disposition of the mind and the will which will make him see things in general in a particular light (ibid.: 28-29).

Christian education, according to Durkheim, consisted in nurturing the soul through a profound conversion:

A conversion, as Christianity understands it, is not really a question of adhering to a particular set of beliefs and specific articles of faith. True conversion involves a profound movement as a result of which the soul in its entirety, by turning in a quite different direction, changes its position, its stance, and as a result modifies its whole outlook on the world….this movement can be the work of a moment….shaken to its foundations by a sudden strong blow, the soul effects this movement of conversion, that is to say, changes its orientation suddenly and at a stroke….it finds itself in the twinkling of an eye confronted with a wholly new outlook; unsuspected realities and unknown worlds are revealed…. it sees, it knows things of which only a moment before it was wholly ignorant….this same shift of perspective can come about slowly as a result of education (ibid.: 29).

"Of course" Durkheim reminds the reader, "we do not take the aim of education to be the production of Christians….Our conception of the aim has become secularized…but the abstract outline of the educational process is not changed. It is still a question of getting down to these deep recesses in the soul…."(ibid.: 30).

The early Christian schools that emerged from cathedrals and monasteries were shaped by a mixed heritage of pagan and Christian, elements (as was the Church itself) that were never fully reconciled. To Durkheim, these contradictions at the basis of Christianity "stretched the whole of that abyss which separates the sacred from the profane, the secular from the religious". This, he suggests, "enables us to explain a phenomenon which dominates the whole of our academic and educational development: this is that if schools began by being essentially religious, from another point of view as soon as they had been constituted they tended of their own accord to take on an increasingly secular character….from the moment that they appeared in history they contained within themselves a principle of circularity" (ibid.: 25).

Although Durkheim here is referring to deep historical and cultural structures at the source of secularized higher education, something like "getting down to these deep recesses in the soul" is occasionally hinted at in modern accounts of higher education. The following six accounts, written during the century following Durkheim's lectures, present educational experiences in terms derived from or suggestive of religious conversion.

To the American writer, Logan Pearsall Smith (1865-1946), whose educational journey took him from Haverford, to Harvard, and then to Balliol College, Oxford, Oxford's bells evoked a life-changing moment in his self-understanding. Bells are widely, almost universally, believed to be an agent of communication between the sacred and secular worlds.

…to me, dwelling thus among the children of this world, and toiling with them for that success which leads to worldly advancement; to me, enmeshed as I was in all the social, political, and philanthropic interests of my companions, there floated through the Oxford air, there drifted over the college walls, a voice, whispering, as in the delicate cadences

of the Oxford bells, enchantments very unlike anything I heard in the college lecture rooms or chapel. If you would save your soul, the voice seemed to whisper, if you would discover that personal and peculiar sense of life which is your most precious endowment, you must practise and perfect a habit of discrimination; amid all you hear and see you must choose whatever is relevant and significant to you, and only that, rejecting with equal sincerity everything that is not really yours—all the interests that you catch from others, all the standards and beliefs and feelings which are imposed on you by the society and age you live in. Watch above all…for those special moments of illumination within…which seem to set free the spirit for a moment (Smith 1939: 190-191).

Henry M. Wriston, President of Lawrence College, and then the first secular President of Brown University (1937-1955), discussed the difficulty in describing the experience of a liberal education:

It is a profound experience. An experience is only superficially something that happens to a person. Fundamentally, it is something which occurs within him, makes some organic change in the structure of his life and thought, and leaves him permanently different. The effects are not transitory; they are part, thereafter, of that mysterious entity which we call his personality. Therefore an experience is not only like, it is indeed a manifestation of, growth itself. As such, it can be described only in its external, its superficial, aspects, for no objective statement can ever give adequate expression to a subjective change (Wriston 1937: 1).

Things which alter life as a whole most significantly, as education and love and religion most certainly do, are all things the values of which are direct, immediate, subjective, and intrinsic, Therefore, they cannot be explained in terms which are inevitably objective, indirect, and derived (ibid.: 2).

The distinguished philosopher and courageous President of the University of Heidelberg, Karl Jaspers, offered this idealization of what German students expect from their university:

…the university with its aura of tradition represents to him the unity of all branches of learning. He respects this unity and expects to experience it, and through it to arrive at a well-founded Weltanschauung. He wants to arrive at truth, wants to gain a clear view of the world and of people. He wants to encounter wholeness, an infinite cosmic order. Science and learning are essentially of the spirit: they seek relations to the totality of all there is to be known (Jaspers 1959 [1947]: 39).

In his autobiography, *Finding the Words*, James Freedman, President of the University of Iowa, and then of Dartmouth College (1987 to 1998), considered his debts to Harvard, his undergraduate *alma mater*:

One of the most important is for the manner in which it stirred my dreams and nurtured my sense of destiny….another is the lesson it taught me about standards….I did not always meet these standards, but a quiet voice invariably reminded me when I departed *from them…Harvard imbued in me…a genuine admiration for what its motto calls veritas, and a belief in the salvation of knowledge. I have spent all of my subsequent years seeking to discharge these debts* (Freedman 2007: 209).

William Cronon, the Frederick Jackson Turner Professor of History, Geography, and Environmental Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, concluded his inquiry into the goals of liberal education with the following observation:

Education for human freedom is also education for human community….In the act of making us free, it also binds us to the communities that gave us our freedom in the first place; it makes us responsible to those communities in ways that limit our freedom….And so I keep returning to those two words of E. M. Forster's: "Only connect." I have said that they are as good an answer as I know to the question of what it means to be a liberally educated person; but they are also an equally fine description of that most powerful and generous form of human connection we call love. I do not mean romantic or passionate love, but the love that lies at the heart of all the great religious faiths: not eros, but agape. Liberal education nurtures human freedom in the service of human community, which is to say that in the end it celebrates love. Whether we speak of our schools or our universities or ourselves, I hope we will hold fast to this as our constant practice… (Cronon 1998: 79-80).

Anya Kamenetz, in her most recent book on American higher education, whets the reader's curiosity with this statement:

Faith in the universal power of higher learning is at the heart of modernity….Warranted or not…this belief is the closest thing we have to a world religion. And it is winning converts at an unprecedented speed (Kamenetz 2010: vii).

What would Durkheim have made of these testimonies of enchantment, mysterious entities, illuminations, salvation, wholeness, agape, and conversion? Surely he would have viewed them as more than mere survivals or individual illusions, and certainly less than statements of any particular religious faith. No doubt he would consider them to be "collective representations", beliefs and categories held in common, that have a discernible past, and a moral relationship to the present. To me they attest to something benevolent in academe that is more animate and perhaps more resilient than Weber's prowling ghost.

NOTES

1. "…the idea of duty in one's calling prowls about in our lives like the ghost of dead religious beliefs. Where the fulfillment of the calling cannot directly be related to the highest spiritual and cultural values, or when, on the other hand, it need not be felt simply as economic compulsion, the individual generally abandons the attempt to justify it al all. In the field of its highest development, in the United States, the pursuit of wealth, stripped of its religious and ethical meaning, tends to become associated with purely

mundane passions, which often actually give it the character of sport" (Weber 2004 [1904-05]: 124).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cronon, William
1998 "Only Connect…: The Goals of a Liberal Education." *The American Scholar* Autumn: 73-80.
Durkheim, Emile
1977 [1904-05] *The Evolution of Educational Thought: Lectures on the Formation and Development of Secondary Education in France*. Routledge & Kegan Paul: London.
Freedman, James O.
2007 *Finding the Words: The Education of James O. Freedman*. Princeton University Press: Princeton and Oxford.
Jaspers, Karl
1959 [1946] *The Idea of the University.* Beacon Press: Boston.
Kamenetz, Anya
2010 *DIY U: Edupunks, Entrepreneurs, and the Coming Transformation of Higher Education.* Chelsea Green Publishing: White River Junction, Vermont.
Lewis, Harry E.
2006 *Excellence Without a Soul: How a Great University Forgot Education*. Public Affairs: New York.
Smith, Logan Pearsall
1939 *Unforgotten Years.* Little, Brown and Company: Boston.
Smith, Page
1990 *Killing the Spirit: Higher Education in America*. Viking Penguin: New York.
Weber, Max
2004 [1904-05] The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Routledge: London and New York.
Wriston, Henry M.
1937 *The Nature Of A Liberal College*. Lawrence College Press: Appleton, Wisconsin.

A Brief History of the Urban Studies Program

Patrick Malone
Professor of American Civilization and Urban Studies

During the urban tumult of the late 1960s, an increasing number of Brown University students and faculty saw the need for coordinated, interdisciplinary study of cities, their problems, and their potential. Formation of an Urban Studies Committee in 1971 began the process. The University decided to establish an academic unit in 1973-74 and made three new joint appointments with Sociology, Economics, and Political Science. Basil Zimmer, a noted urban sociologist, became the first program chair in 1974. Reorganized in 1974 and 1975, the Urban Studies Program changed rapidly from an exciting, if tentative experiment to a full-fledged undergraduate program with a substantial number of enthusiastic concentrators and a small but dedicated faculty drawn from multiple disciplines. The review by an external committee in 1979 reported that Urban Studies had become a "legitimate instructional entity" at Brown. By that time, there were forty five concentrators and four joint appointments. The faculty included current Professor of Urban Studies and Economics Vernon Henderson, and one adjunct professor, Mel Feldman, who now enjoys Emeritus status.

The Urban Studies Program offered students a liberal arts concentration with a strong, but not exclusive, focus on the social sciences. The faculty intended to "approach the study of the city in both practical and theoretical ways." One of the explicit goals of the Program was to promote "university-community cooperation." For many of the concentrators, supervised internships and course-related fieldwork in Providence became a valuable component of their academic experience. Over time, the range of fieldwork opportunities expanded to include projects in nearby towns and with various planning departments, social agencies, community organizations, architectural firms, and preservation groups.

As the program flourished, its commitment to undergraduate education remained firm. The faculty have always been productive researchers, but they saw no need to add a graduate program in urban studies or urban planning. The joint appointments had ample opportunity to work with graduate students in their disciplinary departments. They were able to balance research, teaching, and advising roles in this program and drew much satisfaction from the quality of the Urban Studies concentrators. Excellence in teaching was, and remains, a very high priority in the program. Although Urban Studies faculty teach some of the largest and most popular lecture courses in the university, the program continues to offer a selection of seminars and now requires concentrators to take three of them before graduation.

Surveys have shown that most students appreciate the flexibility and breadth of the concentration requirements. Each concentrator must take urban courses in multiple disciplines and at least one course designed to teach a research skill, such as statistical analysis or econometrics. There are options in every category of the requirements, including the introduction to Urban Studies. Students select their own concentration advisors from the full list of Urban Studies faculty, and they have an opportunity to focus on one or more areas of particular interest to them, such as global cities or metropolitan development. After an external review in 1998, the faculty designed three potential tracks to help guide concentrators in working out individual programs of study. The tracks are Literature and the Arts, Social Sciences, and Built Environment.

The faculty currently includes six joint appointments with departmental bases in Sociology (Hilary Silver), Economics (Vernon Henderson), Political Science (James Morone and Marion Orr), and American Civilization (Patrick Malone and Samuel Zipp), as well as four courtesy (but fully involved) appointments from History (Howard Chudacoff), History of Art and Architecture (Dietrich Neumann), English (Tamar Katz), and Education (Kenneth Wong). A search to replace sociologist David Meyer, who retired last year, will commence this summer. The Urban Studies Program collaborates frequently with the Environmental Studies, Public Humanities, and Public Policy Programs at Brown and with the departments of Architecture and Landscape Architecture at RISD. Many urban courses offered by other Brown departments and programs are listed in the "complementary curriculum" (two courses of the ten required for the concentration), and faculty advisors also accept in that category courses taken as part of approved study-abroad programs. Overseas study has become a very popular option for Urban Studies concentrators, fitting well with the Program's continuing efforts to provide an international perspective on urbanization.

There are now sixty concentrators (juniors and seniors) in Urban Studies. Of the thirty scheduled to graduate this May, seven have successfully completed honors theses. Another honors student is planning for a December graduation. That record number of theses in a single year testifies to the high level of student achievement in the program. Only very capable students are eligible for honors, and all thesis projects must be approved by both a faculty advisor and the program director. Last year, Alexander Werth's outstanding thesis on historic preservation and downtown renewal in Providence was one of four chosen for publication by the university.

More than thirty five years after the establishment of a viable program to study cities and their suburbs, Brown University can take pride in the cumulative accomplishments of the Urban Studies Program, its faculty, and its concentrators.

Brown *Is* Global: New Directions in International Affairs

Matthew Gutmann
Vice President for International Affairs
Professor of Anthropology

All leading universities in the United States have major internationalization initiatives. Each seeks to build on the particular character and strengths of their respective institutions. What will Brown do best in International Affairs? How will we raise our global visibility? And, if successful in our work, what difference will these efforts make for the rest of the world? In short, how can Brown through its academic mission contribute to solving global problems, and how can solving global problems contribute to our core academic goals?

In my new appointment, I draw on twelve years as a professor of anthropology at Brown, extensive international research, collaboration, teaching, and publishing in Latin America and Europe, and an undergraduate degree in modern and classical Chinese. Following is my general vision for International Affairs at Brown; the detailed and complex strategies for success in all these endeavors must be developed through our global collaborations.

The world is not flat for everyone. The Internet, massive migrations, and other factors have brought much of the world closer, but they have not eliminated its inequalities. People, financial capital, art, trade, information, and environmental disasters have moved across borders for centuries – but never at the pace they do now. Further, although the term "internationalization" often has positive connotations in the United States, elsewhere in the world it can conjure up images of the metropoles extending themselves economically, politically, culturally, and militarily around the globe. Internationalization at Brown must take into consideration these diverse meanings. To the extent that we can characterize a Brown ethos and approach to global research and teaching, our faculty and students want to learn about the world in order to solve problems in the world. And this is an excellent starting point.

Brown seeks to attract the best students and faculty from around the world and to be central to the significant scholarly debates of the day. This will not happen unless we build on our strengths, learn to better innovate and coordinate, centralize and avoid duplication, and develop select initiatives to develop substantive new collaborations worldwide. Brown should be known as a premier research university committed to utilizing its great faculty and resources to advance cutting edge scholarship across the globe. For Brown, internationalizing is not a matter of improving knowledge for its own sake, much less to promote parochial interests. Building the global curriculum, expanding international research and cultural experiences of students and faculty, and attracting scholars, writers, scientists, and politicians from abroad to Brown are central components of our scholarly mission and how we will raise our global profile.

We will make our mark in International Affairs by: (1) identifying and developing global collaborations in line with our academic mission; (2) having the most distinguished faculty in particular disciplines and world areas; (3) doing interdisciplinary work around global issues; (4) making breakthroughs in science and technology linked to global concerns; and (5) demonstrating our accomplishments in internationalization. The key will be collaboration with scholars and other partners abroad: we need to work through partnerships of mutual cooperation and equity, measuring our progress through clear evaluation of impact and outcomes, and finding ways to publicize our achievements to both general and select audiences.

Brown can lead in developing vibrant international collaborations in research, training, and teaching in the social sciences, hard sciences, and humanities. Brown should lead in sending its students abroad and attracting the best from abroad regardless of ability to pay. We do well at the former; we need to improve the latter. Brown can lead in finding new ways to disseminate scholarly knowledge as a globally responsible university. Brown should lead in "globalizing" its curriculum and building on our comparative advantages. We also need to establish portals making publications by our faculty available worldwide through the website.

Because Brown is relatively is small, we can more easily encourage interdisciplinary collaborations and react quickly and flexibly to new events and challenges. Addressing issues in global health is a clear example of both, recognizing that health is never a matter of biology alone. Already existing international studies – e.g., through Watson, Population Studies, and the Global Health Initiative – provide a strategic nexus for teaching and research on global matters. Yet our size also obliges us to select initiatives carefully. Perhaps we can learn from Brown's renowned teacher/student collaborations – where size doesn't matter – to provide a model for global partnerships and how internationalization can enhance our academic mission.

Another example of a major international, interdisciplinary, interinstitutional initiative at Brown concerns environmental studies, and in particular adaptation to climate change. In the biological and geological sciences, in the social sciences, and in engineering, to name only the most noteworthy, our faculty and students are conducting advanced research on critical problems that are global in scope and impact, and therefore can be only globally studied and resolved. Whether in Brazil, China, India, or other parts of the world where leading research on the environment and virtually every other field is today carried out, Brown must be building on established partnerships and exchanges, and enhancing these in new ways.

International Affairs at Brown should be dedicated to the proposition that the University serves the world, and not that the world exists to serve Brown. Brown faculty and students can no longer be engaged in the most intellectually challenging issues of the day unless we go ever more global. For International Affairs to flourish, Brown must have an internationalist orientation, an example of what our admission's office likes to call "very Brown." We will contribute to solving global problems such as the spread of infectious diseases, forced displacements, environmental degradation, and economic inequalities, but not through simple curiosity about other cultures. That will not be enough. Brown has an obligation to involve its eminent faculty and students in collaborative academic projects with the leading scholars, scientists, and writers of other countries to advance human knowledge in the service of human wellbeing.

The University should be for What?

David B. Cooper
Professor of Engineering

Though the purpose, in its broad concept, of the University, is to educate the "whole person" for the purposes of leading a fulfilling life, contributing "positively" to society, and earning a living, in light of events of recent years it has become apparent that perhaps the primary purpose of the University should be to educate a knowledgeable electorate – voters who are capable of understanding the major issues society faces, and are motivated to pressure their government representatives to craft and pass meaningful legislation to deal effectively with these issues. At this time, I see this as the problem of education for the purpose of societal survival (thus implying personal survival). In light of the increasing need to address these problems, I raise what I consider basic common sense issues rather than presenting a discourse replete with footnotes and references. More specifically, I make two suggestions; First, establishment of a research program and an Institute for ***An Information Science and Digital Technology for Achieving Human Potential.***; Second***, the devotion, by those students who elect to do so, of the sophomore year to the understanding of the crucial issues facing the voting public in the United States***. The former, if realized, would play an important role in support of the latter, but each is also important in itself. In the following, I amplify on these two suggestions.

To begin, the US and the world more generally are in a rapidly changing dangerous state, and survival, if that is possible without experiencing cataclysmic events, will require outstanding leadership and fast action on the part of the US, since the US is the society that is in the best position to figure out new directions and initiate change. I am, of course referring to global warming, environmental pollution, the impending energy crisis, the needs and demands of an expanding world population, the inadequacy and the highly non-uniform distribution of the earth's resources, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, a nuclear Iran, and in the US the states of health care, education, financial-institutions regulation and practice, etc. *But figuring out new directions and initiating major changes is not something this country can effectively do now, because that requires having decision makers and people in power who understand and are supportive of changes and a voting population that understands the necessity for changes and is motivated to take action in one direction or the other in support of decision makers in making changes. And neither of these requirements is widely satisfied at present!* ***I think the universities are presently the institutions in the best position to do something about this situation!***

The problem as I see it is that we do not have an informed voting population, and many of our leaders are inadequately informed. The average person does not have the information needed to arrive at thoughtful decisions concerning policy issues. Having the "needed" information means having the "most reliable" information and being able to understand it. And this requires having the information in chunks that individuals are interested in taking the time to digest. **As an example**, in reading about biomass based renewable fuels, one reads that it can make a significant contribution to reducing our oil usage and it is also carbon dioxide neutral, i.e., CO2 generated by its burning and processing into fuel is offset by the CO2 that the biomass uses during its growth. On the other hand, one also reads that it takes more energy to produce a gallon of alcohol for fuel than the energy derived by using the gallon as fuel. Now the true answer, in terms of ***present knowledge***, is a purely quantitative engineering matter so one of these conclusions is correct and the other is false! But how is the reader to know which is true and which is false when they both appear in widely distributed media? How are decision makers and the public to know which direction to support? This is an example of a central most-important policy question for which there is largely an unambiguous answer, and there are many such questions. Making information available on these is a most important start that can have crucially important results. But then there are policy questions for which the answers are not completely definitive. *These are trickier, yet still decisions must be made!*

Among the ways universities might try to deal with these voter information-acquisition problems, I suggest two. First is to have most students devote the entire or a significant portion of the sophomore year to understanding pressing policy issues at the level necessary to make informed decisions concerning the representation provided by their elected officials. You ask, "isn't it ridiculous to expect a student to understand these issues at meaningful levels after one academic year of study?" I respond, "is it ridiculous to expect a student, or an individual 20 years past graduation, to vote intelligently for representatives for the Congress and the Senate and the Presidency who are running for office in order to legislate solutions to these problems?" Society does not have a choice: we need to have informed voters! Otherwise, the US experiences a solutions stalemate, or progress toward solutions take place at a slower pace than is necessary for dealing with the rapid changes nature is facing us with. A second suggestion is that universities initiate major research programs in policy-information generation, validation, presentation, and accessibility.

How is the "most useful information" to be made available to people? The presentation of the information and the extent of it should depend on the needs and interests of the user. Some people need information in simple language and small amounts of it. Other people can handle sophisticated levels of information and lots of it. All users should be given some information on the sources of what they are being presented with or some yardsticks with which to gauge the "validity" of the information. Before proceeding further, ***I want to make it very clear that the information to be made available should be as political-agenda free as possible***, that is, the information should be as completely objective as possible and not influenced by the political philosophies of the information preparers. ***The use the users make of the information is another matter. It depends on their personal agendas and is not something the information preparers should be involved with.*** Should our government support providing "valid information" (because the large organizations required will depend on government funding)? A tricky matter, but in the final analysis it is necessary that the government do so just as it is necessary that we have a Food and Drug Administration and an Environmental Protection Agency to protect the consumers' interest and do not leave it to industry to police itself, and just as government bureaus collect and make available statistics and other information.

I believe that an answer to this lack-of-information dilemma is the development and application of ***An Information Science and Digital Technology for Achieving Human Potential. Part of this effort may involve the establishment of an appropriate Institute. I refer to an Information Science****. I am sure there are pieces of such in journalism, law, conflict resolution, computer handling of data and "information", semiotics, etc. As a result of having some knowledge* of statistical information theory, which deals with the minimal bit-representation of messages, the transmission and detection of messages subject to random perturbations, and the protection of the privacy of messages – all very practical usable theory and technology – I think it appropriate and necessary that we develop an information science facilitating the human use of information, i.e., messages. What would this science be comprised of? For starters*: the validity of information, the unambiguous conveyance of information, and the efficient conveyance of information matched to the cognitive-human user.* That is, we are no longer talking about information only in terms of message probabilities, but also messages for the human intellect, comprehension, emotional channel. What immediately comes to mind is that many of us are struck by *the glaring inadequacy in the unambiguous conveyance of valid information* on campuses and in the media over recent years on vital matters such as conflict resolution, economic matters, and a variety of other domestic and international issues. To continue, this new science should address making the pursuit of information easier, satisfying, and entertaining. I suspect that quantitative theories and easily understood, specific, useful tools can be developed to address these and many other issues. I believe that what is needed is an engineering solutions approach to these problems, but by individuals who are multidisciplinary – both engineer and sculptor, both engineer and social psychologist, both engineer and economist, both engineer and humanist. That many of the individuals involved in such an institute would need to be multidisciplinary I am convinced. ***Note, by engineer I also include computer scientists and other technical researchers who are concerned with quantitative analysis of data and information, with quantitative/probabilistic modeling of natural systems, and with the design and evaluation of systems.***

Systems. *Why do Systems enter this picture? Simply because understanding and decision making does not involve individual entities: they involve interdependent entities.* For example, in dealing with health-care reform I do not think we should be dealing with the moral/ethical issue of whether or not the uninsured should be insured. That is a separate but extremely important matter, the solution of which should make use of what I propose. What we definitely do need to consider is what are the consequences of the presently uninsured being given insurance or remaining uninsured. By consequences I mean the financial cost to the taxpayers, the future medical cost depending on the level of medical care when the target population is young and in their working years, the consequent economic productivity of the target population, their societal contributions, etc. How about those voters whose primary concern is the preservation of their present coverage? But their present coverage is not fiscally sustainable under the present health care delivery system: changes must be designed and implemented. Whether or not to take the military option to prevent Iran from going nuclear is, of course, a deeply moral/ethical issue which needs to be taken into consideration. But I am proposing that we omit that from our immediate focus and devote the effort to preparing information on and studying the consequences of taking the military option: if their nuclear facilities are bombed, will the Iranians, as suggested by some analysts, increase their support of terrorism in the West? Or will they be deferred from that by threats of destruction of targets in Tehran if they support an increase in terrorism. (Recall that bombing of targets in Belgrade was instrumental in getting the Serbs to withdraw from Bosnia.).

In conclusion, I suggest the University Curriculum include a year or almost a year of study aimed at understanding, at a level sufficient for being an informed voter, of the crucial problems presently facing the US. Of great importance in supporting this effort is to provide access to "appropriate" information. Providing this information requires solving the three problems: validating the accuracy of information, making it available in unambiguous form, packaging it so that it is useful at various levels of completion and sophistication to people and such that they will want to use it. These are research topics for which there are existing concepts to be built on or for which it is likely that concepts can be developed. The information can be made accessible to the general public over the internet.

The information on many of the subjects of interest will not be definitive, but will be sufficient for most actions that need to be taken. Many of us do not contribute as actively involved voters because we are too busy to search out the information that "may be out there": we are busy with our niche studies, which is fine as long as we have a functioning society, but meaningless if the society does not function. Does Brown really need to do something along the lines I propose? I say: "can the US ***not afford*** to have its universities do something along the lines I propose?" And if the answer is no, then shouldn't Brown be the university to do it?

On Voyaging into the History of Medicine

Peter D. Richardson
Professor of Engineering and Physiology

On a form I received recently I was asked if I had any relatives who had been Fellows or otherwise-designated members of the Royal College of Physicians. That College began in 1518, nearly five hundred years ago, so the question was problematic. For expediency I wrote "Not Known", but thought afterwards I should try further. There is a record of such persons kept by the College, it is Munk's Roll, it has a splendid obituary of William Harvey – partly in Latin – and in volume one I found a very likely name of a relative, Nicholas Fortescue, who graduated from Oriel College Oxford on 19 May 1663 and was subsequently in the Royal College of Physicians. The Fortescues in the UK stem from the time of William the Conqueror (the name derives from forte scutum, strong shield) and there are repeated efforts at refining details of the family tree. I sent off a query to a Fellow of the Society of Antiquarians who is a cousin, also a Fortescue, and he soon came back with a finding of Thomas the Barber/Surgeon as well. As I have a great-god-daughter – also in the same line of the family - just finishing her degree in medicine in the UK, I'll be sending her such findings too.

There are institutions for the study of the history of medicine. A highly prominent one has been supported by the Wellcome Trust. Sir Henry Wellcome, a pioneer in the marketing of pharmaceuticals, was born in Wisconsin on 21 August 1853 and had an early family life introduction to medical practice of his times. He was encouraged to go to a big city to study; his college in Chicago was destroyed in the Great Fire there and he moved to Philadelphia to continue. He was employed as a travelling salesman – an occupation facilitated by the spreading growth of railroads - but also as a scout for anything that could improve the business. There was an early case of technology transfer, learning from the production of pencil leads how pressed compounds of solids could be converted into production of pills, an important step in standardizing doses. An old friend of his, Silas Burroughs, who had already seen opportunities in Europe from being centred in London in marketing pills, invited Henry to join him. In 1880 their partnership formally began there, with their headquarters in Snow Hill surviving until destroyed by bombs in 1941. Well before that, Wellcome had promoted scientific research in laboratories supported by the company. Wellcome, having travelled widely in the world, became a collector, especially of cultural and utilitarian artefacts related to medicine. By the time of his death his collection of books and artefacts was estimated at 1.5 million items. He was knighted in 1932, and elected an Honorary Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons in the same year, a very rare distinction. His will directed at his death (1936) what assets would be under the Wellcome Trust, which included therefore financial assets for operations of the Trust and his collection. In 1968 the Museum and Library were given the name of the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine. By 1972 it had been recommended that the Wellcome Institute should concentrate on postgraduate history of medicine research, and the Library developed as an international research facility.

In 2003, recognizing the 150th anniversary of Wellcome's birth, the British Museum organized an exhibit of several hundred of his collected items, and these have been moved to the Wellcome Building at 183 Euston Road; in a separate move, other parts of his collection are on permanent loan to the Science Museum in London.

In 2003 I participated in an event sponsored by the Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL (University College London, geographically close, had some sort of administrative agreement for the Centre with the Trust). The event was in a series of Witness Seminars, conceived as a method of accumulating history by having persons noted for contributions in particular topic areas to gather and recall together major steps that had occurred, including details that would not be found simply by reading contemporaneous published papers in that topic area. These gatherings led to recordings, which were then edited into useful book-length documents. The one I was involved in during November 2003 was on 'The Recent History of Platelets in Thrombosis and Other Disorders', published in 2005. One limitation was that the Trust had not been able to afford to invite many persons from overseas, and I found myself the sole representative from the US, where my interests in platelets had been driven largely by their function and disfunction in artificial organs, and therefore with much *in vitro* experimentation and where there was a community of researchers working knowingly in parallel with what had been going on regarding platelets in Europe. Despite that limitation, I considered that this method of bringing researchers together to review and collectively recall the many unwritten stories of collaborations underlying various advances was a useful and effective approach to documenting the human side of the history of medicine, and much more quickly than would be achieved by historians trying to pick through correspondence saved in scattered archives, and perhaps not saved well at all.

Despite having been the first history unit in the world to be nominated in February 2010 for center collaborative status for the World Health Organization, I saw a published decision announced at the end of March that UCL and the Wellcome Trustees have decided that the Centre should be closed. I have not seen a rationale for this.
(A petition to save the Centre is at: www.petitiononline.com/WTCHOM/petition.html. There are already more than 3,500 signatures submitted on line)

Regardless of whether the Centre can be saved, there is a need for more support for the study of the history of medicine, including its humanistic as well as technical aspects. The past century has seen revolutions in education for medicine, and in methods of diagnosis and medical care. This history has a growing interdisciplinary aspect to it, and some of it has been and is being written on our own campus. Pierre Galletti (then Vice-President for Biology and Medicine) and I taught together for several years a course on the theory and technology of artificial organs, and year by year we were changing the content to keep up with developments, while also maintaining a research lab in which students taking the course participated in projects. The history also has global political, economic, and sociological aspects. The culture of Brown seems well suited to contribute more, collaboratively, to education and research in all aspects of the history of medicine.

Draft in Progress: Reviewing and its Future

Philip J. Davis
Professor Emeritus of Applied Mathematics

I recently received, through e-mail, an announcement of a large and ongoing literary database, available at a cost to individuals or libraries. It included, as a come-on, reviews of several of my books that neither I nor my publisher had known about. Searching later under "Philip J. Davis reviews," I came across numerous others.

Publishers and authors alike love reviews --- especially when they are favorable. They are considered one of the best marketing tools. Some publishers subscribe to review clipping services, but in any case, the publication in which the review occurs generally forwards it to the publisher, who then sends the review on to the author. This procedure, alas, is imperfect.

Reviews are by no means the only way in which publishers obtain publicity for their lists. For general trade books, publishers advertise. The contracts of popular authors might even specify an advertising budget. Obtaining a review is much less expensive than placing an ad but is less certain. For books in specialized fields, publishers obtain lists of the specialists and use direct mailings to them.

A few good reviews do not necessarily guarantee fame, notoriety or a pocket full of royalties, but they help. Authors and publishers would like the reviews of their material to appear in prominent places, large-circulation newspapers or popular magazines. Books targeted to a special audience such as to scientists or mathematicians require and generally obtain reviews in specialized media.

One or two sentence "reviews" written by recognized personalities are found on the backs of dust jackets. Authors often write their own blurbs, sometimes extravagant, hoping for a payback when the time comes. I have even heard of an author who published a long review of his own book under a pseudonym. "Word of mouth" is an important way in which books become known and authors and publishers try to arrange for TV appearances -- call it mega - word of mouth -- in which to promote their products. (Are these appearances paid for?)

As an author, I have hoped for good reviews of my books and have been favored with many such. But as I suggested in my opening paragraph, I have not seen or made aware of all the reviews that are "out there." The more the merrier, of course; they help sales and reputation and serve as ego food. But what does it matter, really, if I have not seen them all? As far as improving what I have written, if a reviewer suggests some corrections, I may be able to deal with them if my book goes into a second printing or edition. Otherwise: tough luck. If a reviewer suggests that the whole thrust of what I've written is wrong, I ignore it, or I write thanking him and suggesting that he write his own book.

As a reviewer, I have written easily 200 fifteen hundred word reviews over the years, and am still doing it. (The average review is much shorter.) I often use the reviews I write as a "bully pulpit" to vent my own ideas suggested by the book. Publishers send me review copies of new books quite generously, either on their own or upon the author's or my request. However, I can be quite selective as to which books I choose to review. I rarely review books I don't like. I receive responses from readers every once in a while and from authors somewhat less frequently.

Amazon runs reviews supplied by readers, but this practice can be subject to abuse in that friends of an author can submit any number of wildly favorable reviews. I suppose that opposite can also happen and that the least favorable are discarded. I have heard that Amazon has a fairly sophisticated way of getting quality reviews to appear at the top of their lists.

A scandal erupted just recently when Elsevier, a venerable European publisher, famous originally for its medical publications, offered $25 Amazon gift cards to anyone who would give a new textbook five stars in a review posted on Amazon or the Barnes & Noble website. The company has now acknowledged the corrupt nature of this offer and backed off. [1]

We are now moving towards a post i-pod age of revolutionary new communication possibilities. Prognosticators have opined that newspapers are becoming passé and there is some evidence that book reviews are being pushed out of more mainstream media (NYT, etc.) Magazines are being replaced by e-zines. Raw, unrefereed technical papers and other material can be had on line. Reviews such as *Kirkus* and *Choice*, much used by librarians, are on line. Moreover every reader is now a potential reviewer through blogs.

We are moving toward an age when hard copy books compete with hand held Kindles and its clones; an age when the costs of physical copying of published texts is becoming negligible and when the act is hard to monitor. We are moving toward an age when the old structures of copyright protection and royalty payments are being battered. Libraries are struggling to adapt and the Law is struggling to formulate new and effective rules of legality and to create significant precedents. In short, the world of the transference and the ingestion of intellectual material is changing in ways that are hard to describe in their totality. The resulting turmoil constitutes a Second Gutenberg Revolution.

At the moment, other than what I have just mentioned, and these are straws in the wind, I have experienced no substantial changes in the reviewing process itself. Authors and publishers want reviews --- lots of them. Yet, against this churning turmoil, I wonder

[1] http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/06/23/elsevier

how the reviewing process will adapt to the new conditions. In the future, books in some form will be available and opinions about them will certainly be expressed. Such opinions will be sought, but how will they be spread abroad and inform interested parties? With every reader a potential reviewer with his/her opinions posted online, will a distinction be made between the opinions of "professional" or "quality" reviewer whose opinions are perceived as objective and competent and off-the-top-of-the-head opinions of the commonality of readers ? With so many books published, readers will turn to reviewers they trust to help them avoid wasting time and money.

A final point, Success of a title is usually measured by the numbers of copies sold and not by the number of reviews received. A *succès d' estime* may be nice but it doesn't pay the grocery bills.

How will the future shape reviewing and what will be its impact? Qui vivra verra.

References

Gail Pool, *Faint Praise: the plight of book reviewing in America*, Univ. Missouri Press, 2007

FACULTY BULLETIN

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING ARTICLES:

An issue of the Faculty Bulletin will be published in the fall semester. Articles should be submitted by October 29 for publication in November.

Please submit text electronically in Word format to:

Cheryl_Moreau@Brown.edu

Articles should be approximately 1,000 words (two to three pages). If space permits, longer papers will be considered.

Articles and/or questions should be directed to:

Cheryl A. Moreau, Manager
Office of Faculty Governance
402 University Hall
Box 1830
Phone: (401) 863-9440